

A LIST OF THE BIRDS OF THE PHILIPPIN SUB-REGION
WHICH DO NOT OCCUR IN AUSTRALIA.

(Appendix to Mathews' "Reference List to the Birds of Australia").

FAMILY RALLIDAE.

Genus TRICHOLIMNAS.

Tricholimnas Sharpe, *Bull. Brit. Orn. Club* vol. i. p. xxviii. 1893.

Type (by orig. desig.): *T. lafresnayanus* (Verreaux and Des Murs).

1. *Tricholimnas sylvestris*.

Ocydromus sylestris Selater, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1869. p. 472 : Lord Howe Island.

Lord Howe Rail.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

FAMILY BUBONIDAE.

2. *Ninox boobook albaria*.

Ninox albaria Ramsay, *Tab. List Austr. Birds* p. 37. 1888 : Lord Howe Island.

Lord Howe Owl.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 284.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

3. ? *Ninox undulata*.

Strix undulata Latham, *Index Ornith. Suppl.* p. xvii. 1801 : Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island Owl.

Range : Norfolk Island.

FAMILY CACATOIDAE

Genus PLATYCERCUS.

4. *Platycercus elegans nobbsi*.

Platycercus pennantii var. *nobbsi* Tristram, *Ibis* 1885. p. 49 : Norfolk Island

Norfolk Island Crimson Parrot.

Range : Norfolk Island.

5. *Platycercus novaezelandiae verticalis*.

Psittacus verticalis Latham, *Index Ornith. Suppl.* p. xxii. No. 9. 1801 : Norfolk Island.

Synonyms :

Platycercus cookii Gray, *List Spec. Birds Brit. Mus.* pt. iii. sect. ii. p. 13. 1859 : Norfolk Island.

Platycercus rayneri Gray, *Ibis* 1862. p. 228 : Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island Green Parrot.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 369.

Range : Norfolk Island.

FAMILY ALCEDINIDAE.

Genus **HALCYON.**

6. **Halcyon sanctus vagans.**

Alcedo vagans Lesson, *Voy. Coquille Zool.* vol. i. p. 694. 1830: Bay of Islands, New Zealand.

Synonym :

Halcyon norfolkensis Tristram, *Ibis* 1885. p. 49: Norfolk Island.

Wandering Kingfisher.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 393.

Range : Lord Howe Island, Norfolk Island (New Zealand).

FAMILY CUCULIDAE.

Genus **EUDYNAMYS.**

7. **Eudynamys taitensis.**

Cuculus taitensis Sparrman, *Mus. Carlson. Fasc.* ii. No. xxxii. 1787: Tahiti.

Synonyms :

Cuculus taiticus Gmelin, *Syst. Nat.* p. 412. 1788: Society Islands.

Cuculus perlatus Vieillot, *Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. Nat.* vol. viii. p. 232. 1817: Tahiti.

Cuculus fasciatus Forster, *Descr. Anim.* ed. Licht. p. 160. 1844: Tahiti.

Eudynamys cucuicauda Peale, "*U.S. Expl. Zool.*" p. 139. 1848"; cf. 2nd ed. p. 248. 1858: Figi (Ovulan Island).

Long-tailed Cuckoo.

Range : Norfolk Island. Extralimital, but not Anstralia.

FAMILY MUSCICAPIDAE.

Genus **PETROICA.**

8. **Petroica multicolor multicolor.**

Muscicapa multicolor Gmelin, *Syst. Nat.* p. 944. 1789: Norfolk Island.

Synonyms :

Muscicapa erythrogastra Latham, *Inler Ornith.* vol. ii. p. 479. 1790: Norfolk Island.

Petroica modesta Gould, *Synops. Birds Austr.* pt. iv. App. p. 3. 1838: Norfolk Island.

Petroica pulchella Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1839. p. 142 (1840): Norfolk Island.

Muscicapa dibapha Forster, *Descr. Anim.* ed. Licht. p. 267. 1844: Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island Robin.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 441.

Range : Norfolk Island.

Genus **GERYGONE.**

9. **Gerygone insularis.**

Gerygone insularis Ramsay, *Proc. Linn. Soc. N.S.W.* vol. iii. p. 117. 1878: Lord Howe Island.

Synonym :

Gerygone thorpei Ramsay, *Proc. Linn. Soc. N.S.W.* ser. ii. vol. ii. p. 677. 1887: Lord Howe Island.

Lord Howe Flyeater.

Mathews, *Handlist* Nos. 453, 458.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

10. *Gerygone mathewsae* nom. n.

Synonym :

Gerygone modesta Pelzeln (not Gould), *Sitz. k. Akad. Wien*, vol. xli. p. 320. 1860 : Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island Flyeater.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 454.

Range : Norfolk Island.

Genus PACHYCEPHALA.

11. *Pachycephala gutturalis contempta*.

Pachycephala contempta Hartert, *Bull. Brit. Orn. Club* vol. viii. p. xv. 1898 : Lord Howe Island.

Synonym :

Pachycephala howensis North, *Rec. Austr. Mus.* vol. v. p. 125. 1903 : Lord Howe Island.

Lord Howe Thickhead.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 668.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

12. *Pachycephala gutturalis xanthoprocta*.

Pachycephala xanthoprocta Gould, *Synops. Birds Austr.* pt. iii. pl. 55. 1838 : Norfolk Island.

Synonym :

Pachycephala longirostra Gould, *Synops. Birds Austr.* pt. iii. pl. 55. 1838 : Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island Thickhead.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 678.

Range : Norfolk Island.

Genus RHIPIDURA.

13. *Rhipidura flabellifera pelzelni*.

Rhipidura pelzelni Gray, *Ibis* 1862. p. 226 : Norfolk Island.

Synonym :

Rhipidura assimilis Pelzeln (not Gray), *Sitz. k. Akad. Wien*, vol. xli. p. 320. 1860 : Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island Fantail.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 481.

Range : Norfolk Island.

14. *Rhipidura flabellifera cervina*.

Rhipidura cervina Ramsay, *Proc. Linn. Soc. N.S.W.* vol. iii. p. 340. 1878 : Lord Howe Island.

Synonym :

Rhipidura maegillivrayi Sharpe, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1881. p. 789 : Lord Howe Island.

Lord Howe Fantail.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 482.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

FAMILY CAMPOPHAGIDAE.

Genus LALAGE.

15. *Lalage naevia leucopyga*.

Symnorphus leucopygus Gould, *Synops. Birds Austr.* pt. iv. App. p. 3. 1838 : Norfolk Island.

Synonym :

Campophaga longicaudata Pelzeln, *Sitz. k. Akad. Wien*, vol. xli. p. 321. 1860 : Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island Caterpillar Catcher.
Mathews, *Handlist* No. 512.
Range : Norfolk Island.

FAMILY TURDIDAE.

Genus **TURDUS.**

16. **Turdus xanthopus vinitinctus.**

Merula vinitincta Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1855. p. 165 : Lord Howe Island

Vinous-tinted Blackbird.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 540.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

17. **Turdus fuliginosus fuliginosus.**

Turdus fuliginosus Latham, *Index Ornith. Suppl.* p. xlii, 1801 : Norfolk Island.

Synonyms :

Turdus poliocephalus Latham, *Index Ornith. Suppl.* p. xliv, 1801 : Norfolk Island.

Merula nestor Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1835. p. 186 : Norfolk Island. R. Murrumbidgee is an error.

Grey-headed Blackbird.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 541.

Range : Norfolk Island.

FAMILY ZOSTEROPIDAE.

Genus **ZOSTEROPS.**

18. **Zosterops alboocularis.**

Zosterops alboocularis Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1836. p. 75 (1837) : Norfolk Island.

White-breasted White Eye.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 719.

Range : Norfolk Island.

19. **Zosterops tenuirostris.**

Zosterops tenuirostris Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1836. p. 76 (1837) : Norfolk Island.

Slender-billed White-eye.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 720.

Range : Norfolk Island.

20. **Zosterops strenua.**

Zosterops strenua Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1855. p. 166 : Lord Howe Island.

Robust White-eye.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 718.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

Note.—I have shown (*ante*, p. 386) that the type of *Zosterops tephropleura* Gould is the same as *Z. chlorocephala* Campbell and White, and that the Lord Howe habitat is probably wrong. As I can trace no recent examples, I omit, for the present, this bird from the Lord Howe Island List.

It seems strange that these large species of *Zosterops* have never been separated, as they can certainly not be considered typical. The species *Zosterops strenua* Gould, for which I propose the genus name **Nesozosterops** (nov.) disagrees with the characters given as diagnostic of the family in the *Cat. Birds Brit. Mus.*, inasmuch as the very long bill is longer than the head.

FAMILY EULABETIDAE.

Genus **APLONIS**:

Aplonis Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1836. p. 73.

Type (by subs. desig.): *A. fuscus* (Gould).

21. **Aplonis fuscus fuscus.**

Aplonis fuscus Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1836. p. 73 : Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island Starling.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 855 (pars).

Range : Norfolk Island.

22. **Aplonis fuscus hullianus** subsp. n.

Lord Howe Starling.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 855 (pars).

Differs from *A. f. fuscus* in being French-grey below, darker above, head slightly glossy, with the bill stouter : wing 100 mm., culmen 19 mm., tarsus 25 mm., tail 71 mm.

Type : Lord Howe Island, No. 9361.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

FAMILY CORVIDAE.

Genus **STREPERA.**

23. **Strepera graculina crissalis.**

Strepera crissalis Sharpe, *Cat. Birds Brit. Mus.* vol. iii. p. 58. 1877 : Lord Howe Island.

Lord Howe Crow Shrike.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 875 (pars).

Range : Lord Howe Island.

The following birds have become extinct within recent times, but as specimens have been preserved I give their nomenclature.

FAMILY TRERONIDAE.

Genus **HEMIPHAGA.**

Hemiphaga Bonaparte, *Comptes Rendus Sci. (Paris)* vol. xxxix. p. 1076. 1854.

Type (by orig. desig.): *H. novaeselandiae* (Gmelin).

1. *Hemiphaga novaeseelandiae spadicea*

Columba spadicea Latham, *Index Ornith. Suppl.* p. lx. No. 7. 1801 : Norfolk Island.

Synonyms :

Columba gigas Ranzani, *Elem. Zool.* vol. iii. pt. i. p. 223. 1821 : Norfolk Island.

Columba leucogaster Wagler, *Syst. Ar. Columb.* sp. 12. 1827 : Norfolk Island.

Columba princeps Vigors, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1833. p. 78 : Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island Pigeon.

Range : Norfolk Island.

FAMILY RALLIDAE.

Genus **PORPHYRIO.**

2. *Porphyrio albus.*

Fulica alba White, *Journ. Voy. New South Wales* p. 238. 1790 : Lord Howe Island

White Gallinule.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 63.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

FAMILY NESTORIDAE.

Genus **NESTOR.**

Nestor Lesson, *Traité d'Ornith.* p. 190. 1830.

Type (by monotypy) : *N. meridionalis* (Gmelin).

3. *Nestor productus.*

Ptyctolophus productus Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. (Lond.)* 1836, p. 19 : Philip Island (Norfolk Island).

Synonym :

Nestor norfolcensis Pelzeln, *Sitz. k. Akad. Wien*, vol. xli. p. 322. 1860 : Norfolk Island.

Long-billed Parrot.

Mathews, *Handlist* Nos. 299—300.

Range : Norfolk Island.

FAMILY CACATOIDAE.

Genus **PLATYCERCUS.**

4. *Platycercus novaezealandiae subflavescens.*

Cyanorhamphus subflavescens Salvadori, *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* ser. vi. vol. vii. p. 68. 1891 : Lord Howe Island.

Lord Howe Green Parrot.

Mathews, *Handlist* No. 370.

Range : Lord Howe Island.

In the preceding List, consistently with my views already fully expressed in this Journal (vol. xvii. pp. 492-3; vol. xviii. pp. 1-22), I have rejected the generic names commonly illegally in use "ex Brisson." Since the List was prepared the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature have published Opinion 37, which decides that Brisson's generic names are available under the Code. Inasmuch as the Commission did not consider the point I raised in the *Nor. Zool.* vol. xviii. p. 2, it seems clear that as this matter cannot yet be absolutely decided, I must

again point out that the meaning of the word "*binary*" in Article 25 is governed by the interpretation of that word in Article 26; and the interpretation of the word "*binary*" in Article 26 is contrary to the meaning given to that word by the International Commission. These are facts, and it has been suggested by supporters of the Brissonian genera that, inasmuch as the arguments produced by me were unanswerable, the wording of Article 26 must be altered. Is further discussion necessary? It would appear that prejudice has not been eliminated in dealing with this question, as the Opinion was written by Allen, who has already contributed Articles in defence of Brisson, and the statement occurs: "His generic names have availability under the Code, and have also had almost universal recognition since they were proposed."

Thus enters the "law of general consent" as a valid reason for the transgression of the Coded Laws, and once more is the security of our nomenclature threatened.

It is important that the Commission should render their Opinions in accordance with the strict letter of the Laws and not allow sentiment to enter into their minds. I would recall that every *unprejudiced* writer who has investigated the Brissonian genera has declared their illegality, and moreover that the majority of the thinkers who have used Brisson have had qualms as to their justification in doing so. How can the following be reconciled?

ARTICLE 26.—"The tenth Edition of Linné's *Systema Naturae*, 1758, is the work which inaugurated the consistent general application of the binary nomenclature in zoology. The date 1758, therefore, is accepted as the starting-point of zoological nomenclature and of the Law of Priority." Any other interpretation of binary than binomial is here impossible.

Why was the Xth Edition of Linné selected?

Because that Edition was the *first* in which Linné consistently used binomials in his nomenclature.

It might be recorded that the first supporter of the Commission's meaning of binary was a systematist who wrote seventy years ago and who was more logical than the Commission. I refer to George Robert Gray, who accepted Linné's XIIth Edition as regards specific names, but consistently argued that generic names should be accepted from Linné's 1st Edition, wherein Linné adopted a binary nomenclature. In view of the Commission's reading of binary, should not the date 1735 be accepted for the commencing point of zoological nomenclature as regards generic names? As I have noted, if Article 2 can be construed *partim*, the above is the logical conclusion. The absurdity of such a proposition is, I hope, evident, but the Commission's Opinion has made it possible for such corollaries to be adduced.

Now the absolute acceptance of the meaning of the word binary as binomial obviates all such difficulties, and would be in accordance with the Coded Laws and not contrary to them, as the alternative course is. I want this Commission to consider that each Opinion is simply for use as a precedent, and that it should be so worded that workers can easily follow the arguments there produced to a logical conclusion without further recourse. At the present time each Opinion raises doubt as to ever reaching finality. The Code, as worded, gives very little cause for misinterpretation, but some of the Opinions have given me much consideration, and as I have touched upon the Opinions I would here add some comments I have noted.

One of the matters that will probably come up for an Opinion is that cou-

cerning the "Oken" names, which I have declined to recognise, but some of which appear in the American Ornithological Union's *Check-List*.

Opinion 19 contains a certain reference which indicates that the Commission will advise their recognition: viz., "*Plesiops* Oken's *Isis* 1817 [p. 1183] is clearly a quoted name taken from *Plésiops* Cuvier. Its status remains the same as in Cuvier 1817, but no question can now arise as to its not being in Latin form."

This follows the clause: "Accordingly, while *Plésiops*, despite the French accent, might be interpreted as published as a Latin generic name." Note that Cuvier wrote "*Les Plésiops*." This sentence implies that if any one were to accept Cuvier's French names they might be sanctioned. I have never heard any individual dare to suggest such a thing, yet the Commission gravely publish this statement and write of "*Plesiops* 1817," but do not state whether they are using Cuvier's French name or Oken's latinised form. But they conclude: "No question can now arise as to its not being in Latin form."

What an extraordinary conclusion! Now let us have some facts regarding the very points at issue between the A.O.U. and myself.

Cuvier, in the *Règne Animal*, vol. i. 1816 divided the Ducks as follows:

Le grand genre des Canards (*Anas*, Lin.), p. 528, and indicated as sections:

- p. 528: Les Cygnes (*Cygnus*, Meyer).
- p. 530: ,, Oies (*Anser*, Briss.).
- ,, Oies proprement dites.
- p. 531: ,, Bernaches.
- p. 532: ,, Canards proprement dits (*Anas*, Meyer).
- ,, Macreuses.
- p. 533: ,, Garrots.
- p. 534: ,, Eiders.
- ,, Millonins.
- p. 536: ,, Sonchets.
- ,, Tadornes.

and then—

- p. 539: Et diverses petites espèces que l'on désigne sous le nom commun de Sarcelles.

I cannot conceive any one venturing to propose the recognition of any of the preceding French names, yet they are on exactly the same parallel as the name which the Commission discussed. Now Oken issued a List (*Isis*, 1817, p. 1183), and therein is given the following:

Anas; *Querquedula*; *Anas*, *Tadorna*, *Sonchet*, *Marila*, *Eider*, *Clangula*, *Macreuse*, *Bernicla*, *Anser*, *Cygnus*.

Now do we conclude, as the Commission have asked us to, that there can be no question regarding *Sonchet*, *Eider*, and *Macreuse* being pure Latin?

This is the direct consequence of Opinion 19, and here is where the American Ornithologists' Union have differed from myself. They have accepted the other names in the above Oken List but ignored the three I have here named. I have argued that either all or none should be recognised, and therefore, denying that *Sonchet*, *Eider*, or *Macreuse* are Latin, have rejected all.

Now which is right? Shall we have another opinion of a *partim* character,

asking us to accept some, reject others, and leaving the rest to be decided by individual authors, upon each of whose shoulders must rest "the burden of proof that he is justified"?

One more matter upon which I feel the Commission have erred.

In Opinion 36 the Commission have added a dangerous little clause to Article 19, which reads: "The original orthography of a name is to be preserved unless an error of transcription, a *lapsus calami*, or a typographical error is evident." After transcription, the Commission would add ("sen transliteration"), and then note "the evidence should *in general* be present in the original documents." (The italics are mine.)

What will constitute an error of transliteration?

In the past we have had purists correcting purists as to this point, and a good example of the state of chaos that will ensue is evidenced by the name *Chroicocephalus*. Introduced (*Cat. Brit. Birds* 1836, p. 53) in a work apparently published in two parts, the second part (*Hist. Rarer Brit. Birds* 1836, p. 57) gives its derivation *κροικος*, coloured, and *κεφαλη*, head. Note the emendments proposed by purists who indicated errors of transliteration: *Kroicocephalus*, *Kroikocephalus*, *Chroicocephalus*, *Chroecocephalus*, and *Chroocephalus*. Further, this opinion would seem to contradict Article 36, Recommendations, the wording of which is: "It is well to avoid the introduction of new generic names which differ from generic names already in use only in termination or in a slight variation in spelling, which might lead to confusion. But, when once introduced, such names are not to be rejected on this account. Examples: *Polyodus*, *Polyodon*, *Polyodontu*, *Polyodontas*, *Polyodontus*."

But are not such as these due to errors of transliteration?

Does not the acceptance of Opinion 36 necessitate the emendation of generic names ending in *-os*, derived from Greek *os*, into *-us*? This would be the first, others would follow, and many such other questions would be raised, necessitating many Opinions. Must the time of the Commission be occupied in dealing with trivial questions like this? Would it not be better to have confirmed the Recommendations, Article 36, by firmly establishing absolute "one-letterism" and considering every name to be "words formed by an arbitrary combination of letters"?
